

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 21-48 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 24, 26, 27, 28, 34-35, 38-39, 46 and 48 are currently amended, and claims 20 and 49-66 are canceled. Applicants reserve the right to file a Divisional Application to pursue withdrawn, non-elected claims 49-66. Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 24, 26, 27, 28, 34-35, 38-39 and 46 are amended to correct minor typographical errors; the amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is requested. Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIM 48

The Office Action objects to claim 48 and asserts that it does not set forth any active method step or metes-and-bounds of any process. Claim 48 has been amended to overcome this objection.

Furthermore, it is entirely permissible, and in fact the Patent Office encourages, drafting dependent claims of one statutory category to depend from claims of a different statutory category. See MPEP 821.04. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

II. JANUARY 26, 2001 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Office Action states that the January 26, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The January 26, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement states that "[r]elevance of the non-English language references is discussed in the present Specification." For example, a concise explanation of the relevance of JP 862502 is explained in the Specification at paragraph [0006]. The relevance of all of the other non-English language references is also

discussed throughout the present Specification. Thus, the January 26, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement satisfies the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3).

The Examiner is requested to initial and return to the undersigned a copy of the Form PTO-1449 with all references acknowledged. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of the January 26, 2001 Form PTO-1449 is attached.

III. THE CLAIMS DEFINE PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 14, 19-35 and 38-48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,736,225 to Tanaka et al.; and rejects claims 4-13, 15-18 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Tanaka fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 26, 27, 28 and 46. In particular, Tanaka fails to teach or suggest "a first imaging optical subsystem", "a second imaging optical subsystem" and a "third imaging optical subsystem."

The Office Action states that element 28a of Tanaka corresponds to the "first imaging optical subsystem", element 30 of Tanaka corresponds to the "second imaging optical subsystem", and element 28b of Tanaka corresponds to the "third imaging optical subsystem." Applicants respectfully disagree.

The definition of an imaging optical subsystem in this technological art is an imaging optical system that forms an actual image of an object. Neither cylindrical lens 28a nor 28b forms an actual image of an object, and therefore neither lens 28a nor 28b is an imaging optical subsystem.

Tanaka discloses a projection exposure system used for a copy machine, a facsimile machine, an image scanner (image reader), or the like. See Tanaka at, e.g., col. 3, lines 19-22. In the system shown in Figs. 7 and 8 of Tanaka, if only a light beam from light source 18 is transmitted through a direction within the paper plane (i.e., the plane at a lower surface of the document 14) of Fig. 8, a primary image of a document 14 is formed on a reflective

surface 16. Meanwhile, if only a light beam is transmitted through a direction perpendicular to the paper plane of Fig. 8, the first image of the document 14 is formed on a reflective surface (the second surface 26 of a toric lens 22) 26, and a secondary image is formed at an image plane 16. Thus, in the system disclosed in Fig. 8 of Tanaka, the number of imaging times is different depending on the direction that the light beam is transmitted.

In the system shown in Fig. 8 of Tanaka, the cylindrical lens 28a collects light emitted in a direction within the paper plane of Fig. 8, but an actual image is not formed. This is because the cylindrical lens 28a is not an imaging optical subsystem which forms an image of an object. Similarly, the cylindrical lens 28b is also not an imaging optical subsystem which forms an image of an object. Thus, the system of Tanaka fails to teach or suggest a first and a third imaging optical subsystem as recited in claims 1, 26, 27, 28 and 46.

Tanaka also fails to teach or suggest a first folding mirror M1 arranged in the vicinity of a position of forming a first intermediate image to deflect a beam prior to or after the position where the first intermediate image is formed by a first imaging optical subsystem, as recited in claim 1. In addition, the toric lens 22 of Tanaka does not form a second intermediate image with a magnification factor nearly equal to the magnification factor of the first intermediate image, in the vicinity of the first intermediate image, as recited in claims 1, 26-28 and 46.

Furthermore, the system of Tanaka Fig. 8 only includes a cylindrical lens having a positive power and a cylindrical reflective surface having a positive power. Tanaka fails to disclose any "negative lens" as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Tanaka fails to anticipate, or render obvious, the subject matter of independent claims 1, 26, 27, 28 and 46. Accordingly, Tanaka also fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 2-19, 21-25,

29-45 and 47-48, which depend from claims 1, 28 and 46, respectively. Withdraw of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is therefore respectfully solicited.

IV. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants submit an accompanying Information Disclosure Statement with one reference for consideration by the Examiner.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Robert Z. Evora
Registration No. 47,356

MAC:RZE/cfr

Attachments:

Copy of January 26, 2001 Form PTO-1449
Information Disclosure Statement
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 22, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
